



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,720	12/02/2003	Roy M. Zeighami	200300353-1	4318
22879 7590 10/17/2007 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER RUTLAND WALLIS, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 2836	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

OCT 17 2007

GROUP 2800

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/725,720
Filing Date: December 02, 2003
Appellant(s): ZEIGHAMI ET AL.

Jody C. Bishop
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 8/15/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 4/19/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is incorrect. A correct statement of the status of the claims is as follows:

This appeal involves claims 7-8.

Claims 9-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows: Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Foerster (U.S. Pat. No. 3,600,598)

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

The following grounds of rejection are not presented for review on appeal because they have been withdrawn by the examiner.

Rejection to claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foerster (U.S. Pat. No. 3,600,598) in view of Wasaki (U.S. Pub. No. 20030095036)

Rejection to claims 7 and 10 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lethellier (U.S. Pat. No. 4,760,276) in view of Henze (U.S. Pat. No. 4,924,170)

(7) Claims Appendix

A substantially correct copy of appealed claims 7-10 appears on page 16 of the Appendix to the appellant's brief. The minor errors are as follows: claims 9 and 10 are no longer presented for review on appeal.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

3,600,598

Foerster

8-1971

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Foerster (U.S. Pat. No. 3,600,598)

With respect to claim 7 Foerster teaches a method for supplying power to an electronic load (seen in Fig. 2) comprising: connecting a plurality of power supplies in parallel (PS1-PS4); setting, via a power selector circuit (connection of current flow from power supply to load formed with diodes and/or switch means items 28, 32, 34 and 36 see col. 4 lines 19-37 describing the selection or distribution/redistribution of power), a maximum effective voltage for each of said plurality of power supplies to cascade from a highest effective voltage (PS1 +18 volts) for a first (PS1 for example) of said plurality to a lowest effective voltage (PS 4 -12 volts) for a last (PS4 for example) of said plurality; and interfacing (connection to supply power in Fig. 2) said plurality of power supplies with said electronic load through an said power selector circuit.

With respect to claim 8 Foerster teaches preventing current (see diodes in Fig. 2) generated by one of said plurality of power supplies from sinking into another of said plurality.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant's arguments directed to the 102 rejections of claims 7 and 8 as being anticipated by Foerster are not persuasive.

Appellant first alleges Foerster does not indicate that the effective voltage of its power supply modules is set via a power selector circuit. Appellant secondly alleges Foerster's redistribution of electrical current due to load changes does not set the voltages of any power supply modules. Appellant lastly alleges Foerster's redistribution of electrical current in conjunction with a redistribution of loads does not set or change the voltages of power supply modules

In response, Foerster teaches diode isolated power supplies (Fig. 2) cascading from highest effective voltage to lowest effective voltage (Fig. 2 (+18v)-(-12v)) for the distribution of power to connected loads. The redistribution of power between voltage levels as the load condition changes, seen in Foerster, sets the effective voltage and power levels supplied to the load via the switching and transformer arrangement. The transformer and switches of figure 2, which provide the redistribution of power between voltage levels, functions as a power selector circuit. While the voltage of the supply itself is not changed or set, the voltage and power level seen by the load is. Therefore, the effective voltage supplied and seen by the load is controlled and set via the selecting arrangement of the switches and transformer.

Appellant's argument directed to claim 9 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foerster (U.S. Pat. No. 3,600,598) in view of Wasaki (U.S. Pub. No. 20030095036), have been considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection to claim 9 is withdrawn.

Appellant's argument directed to claims 7 and 10 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lethellier (U.S Pat. No. 4,760,276) in view of Henze

Art Unit: 2836

(U.S. Pat. No. 4,924,170), have been considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection is withdrawn.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix


No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Rutland-Wallis



10/12/07

MICHAEL SHERRY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Conferees:

Michael Sherry



David Blum

